COUNTY OF NEW YORK:		I TAP A
THE PEOPLE OF THE STA		
-ag	gainst	: INDICTMENT NO.3853-20
ANTHONY THOMPSON,		: :
	Defendant.	
	100 Centre Str New York, New 1 January 4, 201	eet York 10013
BEFORE:		
THE HONO	DRABLE ANN SCHE	RZER, Judge.
A P P E A R A N C E S	· .	
DISTRICT	OF CYRUS VANCE, LATTORNEY - NE	
	, New York 100	13
BRI	IN PIPPEN, ESQ. IAN KUDON, ESQ.	
Assistar For the	nt District Atto People	orneys
335 Madi	FRITZ, ESQ. son Avenue, 12	
	k, New York 100 Defendant	17
	SAMANTHA SCU	IOTTO

1	THE CLERK: Calendar 15, indictment 3853 of
2	2014, Anthony Thompson.
3	MS. FRITZ: Good morning. Maranda Fritz,
4	F-R-I-T-Z, for Anthony Thompson.
5	MR. PIPPEN: Good morning, Judge. Sean Pippen,
6	P-I-P-E-N, for the People.
7	MR. KUDON: Good morning. Brian Kudon,
8	K-U-D-O-N, for the People.
9	THE COURT: This case is on today for sentence.
10	I have received and thoroughly reviewed the presentence
11	memoranda that were submitted by both parties. Is there
12	anything else that either party wishes to add?
13	MS. FRITZ: There's one very brief matter I'd
14	like to discuss with your Honor at the bench.
15	(Whereupon an off-the-record discussion was
16	held.)
17	THE COURT: Do you want to speak to your client
18	before we continue?
19	MS. FRITZ: No.
20	THE COURT: Please arraign the defendant for
21	sentence. Wait a second, did we get a presentence report
22	in this case?
23	MS. FRITZ: Yes, we did.
24	THE COURT: Can I have that, please. Thank you.
25	THE CLERK: Anthony Thompson, you are before the

## PROCEEDINGS

Court for sentence following your conviction of securities -- scheme to defraud, count 2; count 12, securities fraud and count 46, securities fraud. Before being sentenced the Court will allow you, your attorney and the ADA an opportunity to address the Court with any matters relevant to sentencing. For the People.

MR. PIPPEN: Judge, just at this point we would request that the Court impose sentence of one to three years incarceration on each of the three felonies to which Mr. Thompson pled guilty to run concurrent with each other. And we'd ask that a judgement in the amount — in the plea agreement be entered, \$869,910 in favor of the District Attorney's Office to be used for paying back the victims.

THE COURT: That's a change from what's been requested in the past, meaning what you had asked for was the jail sentence and submitted a memorandum in support of that request. I think that the defendant did not make the payment he was supposed to make. If he is sentenced to jail that's punishment enough for not making that compensation. If you want to renegotiate a repayment that's a different story, but you've never approached the Court with an indication that that's how you want to move forward.

MR. PIPPEN: We understand that, just -- okay, nothing further then. We had come prepared to address

## PROCEEDINGS

certain	representations	that	were	made	in	the	sentencing
memo.	I'm prepared to d	do so	•				

THE COURT: Yes, I'd like to hear whatever. If there's something briefly you want to state I'm certainly interested in hearing it. It's obviously a case that I spent a lot of time reading the memoranda on so I could understand the nature of the scheme that was involved here.

MR. PIPPEN: Okay, thank you, Judge. This should be very brief. So, as articulated in our memo and again throughout the course of the case, it's been our position consistently that Mr. Thompson was engaged in a lengthy and well orchestrated scheme to artificially defraud investors through the manipulation of stocks to drive up their value and to dump shares controlled by himself and his coconspirators onto the market, onto unsuspecting investors and then to move on to the next, leaving the investors to hold the bag.

So after reviewing the defendant's submission, which our understanding was being submitted for, I believe, the purposes of sort of asking this Court for mercy for a non-jail sentence, it's our conclusion that that memorandum fell short and was an unfortunate step in the wrong direction. Specifically there are a number of misrepresentations in there, and I'll just address a couple of them that I think are important and I think illustrate a

broader problem.

One of the arguments that was made was well, that a Federal Court had reviewed Mr. Thompson's disclaimers and found they were compliant with rule 17(b) of the Federal Securities Law. That may be technically true, but this Federal Court never said there was not a pump and dump operation going on or there wasn't securities fraud. It was merely that a specific portion of the disclaimers was compliant with Federal Securities Laws. It had nothing to do with saying that the sale or that stock offering was not fraudulent or anything else. And frankly it has nothing to do with what happened here because our case is not based upon Federal Securities Laws.

THE COURT: One moment. I apologize, go ahead.

MR. PIPPEN: Another one of the points that was raised in the sentencing memorandum was related to the defendant's use or consultation of attorneys during the course of the fraud, I guess the argument being that because he consulted with attorneys this was all sort of legitimate in some ways. Now, perhaps we would be willing to concede that the defendant wanted his disclaimers as news letters to be facially compliant with Federal Securities Laws, but again that has nothing to do with the disguise of ownership and control of the stock and the manipulation of the market that was specifically hidden

## PROCEEDINGS

from investors and not disclosed to the lawyers. And
Defense Counsel and Mr. Thompson know that during the
course of the investigation we met with these attorneys and
addressed these issues.

The memorandum ignores activity post 2010 and it would be difficult to be brief and address what we consider to be a number of misleading statements in the sentencing memo, but there is one sentence in there that I think is worth just quoting here, which kind of is the culmination of what we think is the problem. "Certainly Mr. Thompson made mistakes and ultimately he pled guilty to transactions because he participated in what turned out to be a fraud on shareholders."

So in short, defendant now wants to have it both ways. He wants to stand here and say I should be given mercy because I'm taking responsibility for my actions without actually taking responsibility for his actions.

And this is thus not a plea for mercy, but it is doing what the memo said it wasn't setting out to do, it's a blatant attempt to minimize and trivialize the defendant's conduct and his culpability.

And even worse what is problematic is if you read it, the defendant apparently is the victim of this whole thing. This is Kevin Sepe's fault, which is a ridiculous statement. Kevin Sepe didn't make him do anything. And

## PROCEEDINGS

we, the People, have never alleged or argued that Kevin Sepe was the mastermind behind this entire organization. That was never our position, nor does it really even matter. He's apparently the victim of a divorce being attacked by teams of lawyers that are being motivated by believing it was bitterness. He couldn't get a job because he was so humiliated and harmed emotionally by what was happening, all the while again while he's living off this trust that's supporting his lifestyle. And again, as illuminated or as discussed in our memo, our belief that that trust was funded by proceeds of the fraud.

We're here again because the defendant pled guilty under an agreement and it's that simple. This is not about what other defendants who cooperated or pled guilty early got. This is not about what relitigating these issues. And certainly while we stand here and we're sympathetic and understand there are collateral consequences to an individual going into jail, this is a problem of his making, Mr. Thompson's making.

Every defendant has family, has children and the defendant had a wife and kids when he chose to do this. Every defendant has personal issues that can be exacerbated when they go into custody. And no one wants to go to jail, including individuals who are charged and accused with crimes like this defendant. So finally the defendant is

1	here to be held accountable for the fraud that he engaged
2	in, the harm that he inflicted on the victims of this
3	scheme. And to try to somehow blame the District
4	Attorney's Office, this Court for the consequences of his
5	own conduct, his fraud is not a plea for mercy, it's a
6	guilt trip.
7	THE COURT: It's an attempt at a guilt trip,
8	Counsel. It's an attempt at a guilt trip.
9	MR. KUDON: An attempt at a guilt trip. And,
10	thank you, your Honor, and thus for all of these reasons,
11	and I can go into more if necessary, but we believe that
12	the violation of the agreement or his violation of the
13	agreement, the sentence that we are recommending of one to
14	three is appropriate and we ask the Court to impose that.
15	Thank you for your indulgence, your Honor.
16	THE COURT: Thank you. Ms. Fritz.
17	MS. FRITZ: Thank you, your Honor, and I really
18	do appreciate
19	THE COURT: I'm going to ask you to raise the
20	microphone up, so I can hear you.
21	MS. FRITZ: First of all I want to say that I
22	appreciate, that we very much appreciate the time that your
23	Honor has spent reviewing the materials related to what is
24	obviously a fairly complicated case. What I want to first
25	address is Mr. Pippen's point that was then echoed by the

	PROCEEDINGS
1	Court, which is why does the sentencing submission spend so
2	much time talking about Mr. Thompson's business and I'll
3	tell you why. This has been a long road to hold, your
4	Honor.
5	THE COURT: What do you mean when you say it was
6	echoed by the Court?
7	MS. FRITZ: When the Court said it was an
8	attempt at a guilt trip.
9	THE COURT: I think my understanding of what the
10	Assistant was trying to say was more focused on the
11	personal ramification that will be facing the defendant
12	should he be incarcerated. Was I correct about that?
13	MR. KUDON: That's correct.
14	THE COURT: I didn't take it to have anything to
15	do with the business portion of the memo.
16	MS. FRITZ: But the reason why the brief spends
17	so much time is because of this, this indictment occurred
18	back in 2014. It occurred with much fanfare, that it was

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

back in 2014. It occurred with much fanfare, that it was a mega fraud, 85 counts, B felonies, you name it. Ever since then, for years now, we have been dealing with a very simple fact which is the DA takes the position that there is this mega fraud. We take the position, a very simple position, that is well borne out by the documents, that Mr. Thompson was trying very hard to run a good business and then ran into, was hired by Kevin Sepe, and at that point

	1
	2
	3
	4
	5
	6
	7
	8
	9
1	0
1	1
1	2
1	3
1	4
1	5
1	
1	7
1	8

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

engaged in improper conduct in connection with those transactions.

It's two different things, but each one of those speaks volumes about Mr. Thompson. What we tried to do in this submission was to start by laying out what the structure was that was involved here. And I think it's critically important because the DA's submission mushes everyone together as if it was one group of individuals sitting in a clubhouse. Here's what it was. It was —

THE COURT: I don't need you -- I took a very long time to familiarize myself with and understand the nature of the scheme that was involved, including reading your very voluminous submission and speaking with Judge Conviser who had presided over the case for a significant period of time. So I'm willing to hear anything additional that you have to say with respect to sentence, but I really don't want you to repeat your version of the scheme as it occurred, because I'm familiar with it having read your very thorough papers.

MS. FRITZ: I don't want to repeat it and I appreciate the time the Court spent, but again responding to what Mr. Pippen just said, Mr. Pippen would have the Court believe that there was a group of individuals all acting together and that's not the case. Kevin Sepe had some very close associates down in Florida that he had

## PROCEEDINGS

worked with for many, many years. Those individuals were defendants in this case; Dervalli, Oxsalida, Rodriguez, Halperin. All of those individuals worked with Mr. Sepe day in and day out in his enterprises doing what he was doing.

And Mr. Pippen emphasized the idea that there was disguised control here. Those are the People who did the disguising of the control. Those are the people who served as nominee shareholders, whether it's Dervalli, whether it's Oxsalida, whether it's Rodriguez, those are the people that were working with Sepe day in and day out accomplishing this nominee shareholder scheme.

Then switch across the country, Mr. Thompson in Maryland had created a very successful business and Sepe hires him. The business was successful and compliant. Why did I emphasize that there was so much of an effort to be compliant? Because I think that speaks volumes about who he is and whether or not he was intending to hurt people. So do I think that's absolutely important, yes. Some of the communications that I provided some of the exhibits that were attached are like documents I've never seen in 40 years of doing this work.

THE COURT: Ms. Fritz, are you withdrawing your client's plea of guilty to having committed this crime?

Because this crime involves knowledge of a scheme to

## PROCEEDINGS

defraud. What you are essentially saying now is that he was just sort of lured into something against his will and that seems to be contrary to his plea of guilty.

MS. FRITZ: What I'm trying to establish is if you can picture a guy who is running a very good, legitimate business, he gets hired by Kevin Sepe and then in those transactions, and he has pled guilty with respect to two of them, he engaged in improper conduct for which he has stepped up and accepted responsibility. The view from this side of the room is mega fraud involved, everything was a scam. I'm trying to differentiate. I'm trying to say did he do wrong things? Yes, he did and he's trying to take responsibility for it. But this whole mishmash of trying to just clump everybody together I think is inappropriate roles in —

memorandum was about one-twentieth the size of yours. They simply summarized the facts and made — they noted that the defendant had failed to abide by the plea agreement. So I don't think that they in any way have exceeded their authority in making an appropriate sentence recommendation. They haven't gone into the facts of what anybody other than what your client did. You are the one who has gone into the facts of what people other than your client did, so I really am containing — would like to contain the argument

## PROCEEDINGS

to your client's conduct. And I can't help but observe
that the voice from your side of the room is an aggregation
of responsibility, rather than owning up to what your
client did. To say your client -- I'll reserve my
comments for when I impose sentence.

MS. FRITZ: First of all, of course I've gone
through each and every sentence that was imposed in this
case, whether by Judge Conviser or by Judge Riber. I've

through each and every sentence that was imposed in this case, whether by Judge Conviser or by Judge Biben. I've done it because that's the law, because the Court of Appeals, for example, has reversed a case where there was a failure to consider and ensure that sentences were proportionate one to another based on role and other factors. It is the law, that is what they expect. And in this case they reversed and remanded because the sentence — because the sentencing did not properly consider that issue. I think there's no question here that I view it as vitally important what was done. Ordinarily in a case like this the Prosecution —

THE COURT: Please address your comments to what the sentence for your client should be.

MS. FRITZ: Okay. Given, I think, issues like role in personal circumstances are terribly important along with the background in terms of what this -- what the DA has focused on. Before I get to talking about Mr. Thompson personally I have to address this issue that's been raised

1	by the DA and that is that because Mr. Thompson violated
2	the plea agreement, because he failed to pay the fine that
3	incarceration is appropriate.
4	I'm sure the Court is aware, I'm sure the Court
5	is aware under the relevant provisions of the Penal Law and
6	the Criminal Procedure Law, inability to pay a fine cannot
7	be, cannot be a basis for incarceration.
8	THE COURT: This was not a fine, this was
9	restitution.
10	MS. FRITZ: Inability to pay restitution.
11	THE COURT: Okay, I hear you, yes.
12	MS. FRITZ: So the Penal Law and the Criminal
13	Procedure Law are very clear in terms of how that issue is
14	addressed. And the fact that for a long time now the
15	standard has been that we don't put people in jail for
16	that. We do put people in jail and there was a recent
17	issue involving failure to pay a fine or restitution. We
18	put people in jail when they fail willfully to pay an
19	amount that's due. We don't put people in jail, and the
20	provisions of the CPL don't permit it, where they're not
21	able to pay the fine. We only incarcerate individuals and
22	impose monetary

THE COURT: I don't think you've spent a lot of time in this courthouse if you believe that's true.

MS. FRITZ: Your Honor, again going through

23

24

25

1	60.27
2	THE COURT: I'm talking about the reality of
3	this courthouse. I understand your point. What is your
4	next point?
5	MS. FRITZ: Let me just follow-up then, because
6	to me this is very clear from Penal Law 80 and 60.27 that
7	inability to pay
8	THE COURT: Ms. Fritz, your client entered into
9	a plea agreement. Did he enter into a plea agreement in
10	which he agreed to make a certain amount of payment within
11	a certain amount of time?
12	MS. FRITZ: Yes.
13	THE COURT: Has he made one payment? Has he
14	paid even one dollar?
15	MS. FRITZ: He has not. And the issue is not
16	the issue before this Court is
17	THE COURT: Is your client living in a shelter?
18	MS. FRITZ: No.
19	THE COURT: Okay, I don't accept the proposition
20	that your client has not been able to make a single payment
21	in the period of one year, so to the extent you are arguing
22	he's literally unable to make any payment I do not accept
23	that.
24	MS. FRITZ: Okay. The other thing I would point
25	out as a matter of law is that he was never Court ordered

1	to make a payment. He has never failed to make any payment
2	that has ever been directed by any Court anywhere. Now, as
3	I said before, incarceration even for failure to pay
4	Court-ordered restitution is not permissible under our laws
5	absent failure to pay, absent failure to pay.
6	THE COURT: Please move on to your next point.
7	MS. FRITZ: I want to make the record here, your
8	Honor, cause given where we are, we've ended up, this is
9	incredibly significant. In order even to order payment
10	of a fine, inability to pay has to be considered. And
11	incarceration, for example
12	THE COURT: I told you I don't accept your
13	client has been unable to make pay single payment in the
14	course of a year.
15	MS. FRITZ: We have provided ample
16	THE COURT: I'm going to let you speak for five
17	more minutes because I do have a very full calendar, as you
18	know. I did provide you with an opportunity to put all of
19	your arguments in writing. You provided me with a very
20	extensive sentence memorandum. You are now repeating the
21	same thing over and over again when I have already
22	indicated that I have an understanding of your arguments.
23	MS. FRITZ: I understand that.
24	THE COURT: So I'm going to give you five
25	minutes starting now to finish your argument and I don't

think that's unfairly cutting you off.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. FRITZ: I just want to spend some time talking about the information that you received about Mr. Thompson himself. Obviously you received a great many letters that talk about who he was, who he is, what he's become over the last six years. I want to introduce you to some of the folks that wrote those letters. Mr. Anthony Thompson is Mr. Thompson's Father. He's an attorney in Washington now for more than fifty years. With him is Bruce Crawford, another individual who wrote a letter talking about the relationship that the family has and the remarkable relationship that exists between Anthony and his three young children. With them is Lance Seacrest, he also wrote a letter and talked about -- not the business that Anthony had done, and talked about Anthony helping his family in a terrible time of need and talked about the children and their relationship with Anthony. So to me, who he was, who he is, who he has become is critically important.

Second, the reason why I'm asking for no jail is because over the course of the last eight to ten years he has suffered every kind of penalty, punishment that one could possibly ask, that one could possibility inflict on someone. Everything from the loss of every sort of business, professional reputation, his marriage, the loss

## PROCEEDINGS

of his own mother even as the case was going on. He has gone through unbelievable pain and I know this because I've been there for six years alongside him and alongside this family. The man will never reoffend, that's a given.

We believe that we have established that this was not a willful failure to pay. We believe that we have tracked through every moment of why the agreement was entered into. I even provided for the Court a copy of the arbitrator's order that said we could pay the fine, it's one of the exhibits in here. He reasonably, very reasonably believed that that fine could be paid when he entered into that agreement.

I also want your Honor to know that when we took this plea in front of Judge Biben we talked at great length because I had very real concerns given the amount of money. And I spoke with Judge Biben and said what are we going do if we come back a year from now and what we had envisioned doesn't happen? And Judge Biben in no uncertain terms said the issue becomes whether he was able or not, whether there was an ability to pay or not. I have tried to lay out what Mr. Thompson's life has been over the course of the last year. Not only did we get in a fight for —

THE COURT: That is not indicated anywhere in the plea agreement.

MS. FRITZ: That I fought for and got an order

## PROCEEDINGS

from	the	arbitrator	to	pay	this	amount?	Ιt	is	one	of	the
exhik	oits										

THE COURT: I'm talking about what you say Judge Biben said.

MS. FRITZ: It's not -- I mean, again to me it's just flat out consistent with what the law is, which is if there is -- if he doesn't pay -- and this was not a court-order, Judge, this was a plea agreement. This was a breach of contract. In a breach of contract case, your Honor, there are mitigating circumstances.

THE COURT: I understand and we're at two minutes now.

MS. FRITZ: The sentence must be commensurate with the sentences that are being imposed on the other individuals in this case. As I said, the Court of appeals has reversed for resentencing where the Court failed to take into account whether a sentence was disproportionate to others. Here every single individual, whether it's Kevin Sepe, whether it's the people who deliberately engaged in acts as nominee shareholders, deliberate willful violations, those individuals, people at a lower rung that assisted Mr. Sepe and then the people completely outside of the organization, the People that did the promotional materials, including Jay Fung who actually managed to get himself indicted for insider trading while awaiting

## PROCEEDINGS

sentencing, the DA went in front of the Judge and still insisted that he should get jail time, same position, and Judge Conviser gave him time served. There is not one person here from the top of the latter all the way down that has had jail imposed and it's extremely concerning given the fact that we think that the inability to pay is clear.

Here's what I came before the Court to ask for. The Court is absolutely correct that if you put Mr. Thompson in jail you cannot award any significant monetary restitution. He was, remains willing to do that, to repay investors, to work his tail off after it took him six years to get a position, to get a job. He's more than willing to do that.

The alternative at this point, this is a total crossroads, right now at this moment. He has finally regained custody of the children. He's got a small apartment in Maryland and he's finally gotten a job. He had his first closing in that real estate position recently. He will either be able to continue that, to make restitution, to do as Kevin Sepe, hundreds of hours of community service, that's one path . And we have here five organizations in the Maryland area that we've researched for him to perform community service.

THE COURT: Has he done any community service or

1	any volunteer work during these past years?
2	MS. FRITZ: Yes, he was on the Board of Habitat.
3	He's been involved in United Way.
4	THE COURT: Being on the Board is different from
5	doing community service.
6	THE DEFENSE: He's also participated in their
7	activities.
8	THE COURT: He's built houses while he's been on
9	the Board of Habitat for Humanity.
10	MS. FRITZ: Yes, he has.
11	THE COURT: Mr. Fritz, I have to cut you off.
12	I'm sorry, I gave you a very fair warning and it's five
13	minutes past the warning I've given you.
14	MS. FRITZ: The Court is aware at this point you
15	can throw Mr. Thompson in jail. There will be no monetary
16	component to it. He will lose his children. He will lose
17	his job. He will lose the ability to be productive. And
18	it is particularly difficult to accept that, whereas I said
19	I don't believe that inability to pay can be a basis for
20	incarceration and all it does is ensure an inability to
21	pay. This is a precise circumstance where somebody has
22	rebuilt from the ground up, can do better. He can and I
23	believe
24	THE COURT: Okay, is there anything you want to
25	say Mr. Thompson before I sentence you?

1 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. Your Honor, I 2 stand before you and the Court today due to my actions and 3 my mistakes. These last six years have been an incredibly 4 painful experience and one that I will always carry with 5 me. After my indictment in 2014 my wife and I separated. 6 We are close to finalizing a painful and difficult divorce, 7 most of all for our three children, Skylar 12, Colton 9 and 8 Beckam 7. I've lost my mother to a devastating battle with 9 cancer and saw what my criminal case and the worry brought 10 to her in her final days. I've lost all my money, lived 11 through a painful custody fight and finally gained joint 12 custody of my children. 13 I've caused harm to people who invested in the companies that I brought them and severe pain and heartache 14 15 to my loved ones. I do not say these things to your Honor, 16 to this Court as a plea for sympathy, but to take 17 responsibility for my actions. I understand and I want 18 your Honor to understand that I know what I did was wrong and I've seen the pain that I've caused so many people. 19 20

21

22

23

24

25

It's been a long road back, but I've fought hard to try and rebuild my life and become a better man each day. My entire world is my children, obviously I want to be with them. Based on the custody case the Court experts agree it is also important for them to be with me.

Rebuilding a professional life was much harder

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

PROCEEDINGS

than I imagined it would be, but I studied and passed the real estate exam on the first try and have been given a second chance by an amazing individual to earn money for my family and to take care of my obligations. I know if your Honor sentences me to jail I will lose it all. I'm asking your Honor to allow me to go back and take care of my family and continue to be a devoted father and a productive member of society.

THE COURT: Mr. Thompson, I appreciate your words and I particularly appreciate your taking responsibility for the harm that you caused to the people who invested money in securities which were not what they purported to be and I think that it's exceedingly important. I appreciate that because I think it's critical for you to acknowledge that you stole money from people by your own free will. That you are a person who has been given many, many advantages that most people who come through this courthouse have not been given educationally, professionally, family-wise. You have been given tremendous opportunities and yet you and presumably your codefendants, even though I don't know anything much about their cases, engaged in a scheme that was motivated by greed and a lack of consideration for the people who were going to be harmed by what you did.

I believed that the plea agreement you entered

## PROCEEDINGS

into was incredibly generous. I think that the plea agreements in this case were incredibly generous given the crimes that took place, which had tremendous financial consequences for many people and, as I said, were motivated by greed and a lack of consideration for what would happen to the person on the other side.

I am of course sympathetic to the fact that it will be a tremendous hardship for your children if you go to jail and for you. And putting people in jail, despite my position, is my least favorite thing that I do at my job because it's terrible for everybody's family and every person to have to go to jail, but the fact is that you were given an incredibly reasonable, generous plea offer by the People. And there are -- I understand that you've come upon financial hardship, but the fact that through this time there hasn't been any effort to make any payments toward the goal to me speaks volumes about your motivation and your belief that you would get away with it.

So, I'm terribly sorry for your children that you will be absent from their lives for a period of time, however that is something that happens to anybody who commits a crime and is caught and has to answer for it. I have already told you that the -- your lawyer that I will permit you to surrender yourself for sentence. The sentence of the Court on this case is going to be one year

1	in jail on each count. The sentences will run concurrent
2	with one another and you can let me know what's a good date
3	for your client to step in.
4	MS. FRITZ: Your Honor, I have one last request.
5	We took a hard look at Shock and whether Shock would be
6	appropriate in the event of imposition of jail time. I
7	know your Honor is familiar with Shock
8	THE COURT: I don't know if he can get Shock
9	with a City jail sentence.
10	MR. PIPPEN: My understanding is it's State, but
11	I could be wrong.
12	THE COURT: I was specifically not sentencing
13	him to State time, so
14	MS. FRITZ: Okay.
15	THE COURT: I mean that was my compromise in
16	your client's benefit. If you think he would be better off
17	having Shock and a State prison sentence
18	MS. FRITZ: No, your Honor, I was actually
19	hoping you would consider a split if you were not going to
20	give what the People were asking for.
21	THE COURT: What date would your client like to
22	surrender?
23	MR. KUDON: Your Honor, I'm sorry for
24	interrupting, bail was exonerated on the date of the plea.
25	We would, considering your Honor is going to impose a jail

1	term
2	THE COURT: First of all, one person at a time.
3	Are you making a bail request?
4	MR. KUDON: Yes, your Honor.
5	THE COURT: That's denied. Obviously my promise
6	of the sentence is contingent of coming back and
7	surrendering yourself. I'm sure you'll do that. The last
8	thing you want to do is increase the amount of time and if
9	you don't come back to court on the date of your sentence
LO	that's what's going to happen. I assume that's obvious to
L1	you.
L2	THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
L3	THE COURT: I was giving you an opportunity to
L 4	surrender yourself so you can get your affairs in order and
L5	speak to your children.
L 6	THE DEFENDANT: Thank you, your Honor.
L7	THE COURT: What date would you like?
L 8	MS. FRITZ: Two weeks, your Honor.
L 9	THE COURT: How about January 25th how about
20	January 31st?
21	MS. FRITZ: Thank you.
22	(Continued on next page.)
23	
24	
25	

1	THE COURT: January 31st for sentence.
2	* * *
3	
4	CERTIFICATION
5	It is hereby certified that the foregoing is a true and accurate transcript of the
6	proceedings.
7	
8	SAMANTHA/SCUOTTO
9	Official/Court Reporter
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	